

LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO

Dale K. Galipo, Esq. (SBN 144074)
dalekgalipo@yahoo.com
Marcel F. Sincich, Esq. (SBN 319508)
msincich@galipolaw.com
21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Phone: (818) 347-3333
Fax: (818) 347-4118

GRECH, PACKER, & HANKS

Trenton C. Packer (SBN 241057)
tpacker@grechpackerlaw.com
7095 Indiana Ave Ste 200
Riverside, CA 92506
Phone: (951) 682-9311

Attorneys for Plaintiff GEORGE GONZALEZ

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GEORGE GONZALEZ,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA; CITY OF
HEMET; PATRICK SOBASZEK;
ANDREW REYNOSO; SEAN
IRICK; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 5:25-CV-00331-KK-DTB
[Honorable Kenly Kiya Kato].
Magistrate Judge David T. Bristow

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' *EX PARTE*
APPLICATION FOR
MODIFICATION OF
SCHEDULING ORDER AND
TRIAL CONTINUANCE**

PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' EX PARTE APPLICATION

This is a federal civil rights action involving an officer-involved shooting where multiple officers from various public agencies filed indiscriminately at Plaintiff, including when he was incapacitated and on the ground. Defendants have filed this *ex parte* application to modify the scheduling order to, among other things, complete more discovery they could have completed months ago. Plaintiff is sympathetic to defense counsel's upcoming maternity leave and, for that reason, agreed and continues to agree to a continuance of the trial date to a mutually agreeable time. In fact, just days before the instant application was filed, Plaintiff provided a draft stipulation with proposed dates and invited further conference on acceptable dates. Defendants ignored Plaintiff's draft stipulation without further comment, choosing instead to file this unwarranted application.

Defendants also contend they require additional time to complete fact discovery. Plaintiff agrees only to the extent any extension will permit Defendants to take Plaintiff's deposition in custody and give the parties an opportunity to resolve any ongoing disputes regarding already propounded discovery. Plaintiff believes discovery responses to be served today will address the ongoing disputes.

Any further extension of the discovery cut-off is, however, unwarranted. This Court issued its scheduling order on May 9, 2025, setting a discovery cut-off of November 20, 2025. The deadline to propound discovery other than setting depositions was October 6, 2025. Plaintiff will complete discovery within the allotted time. Defendants offer no persuasive justification for their failure to do so.

As set forth above, Plaintiff agrees with an extension of the cut-off *only to permit Plaintiff's deposition and allow for time to resolve existing disputes based on already propounded discovery*. Plaintiff further agrees to accommodate Defense counsel's maternity leave. Thus, Plaintiff opposes Defendants' motion to extend any dates other than those necessary to complete Plaintiff's deposition. Plaintiff agrees to continue the trial date to a mutually agreeable date for all parties and the

1 Court. Plaintiff proposes August 18, 2026, or August 25, 2026 as those are the only
2 dates available for all Plaintiff's trial counsel.

3
4 DATED: November 6, 2025

**LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO
GRECH, PACKER, & HANKS**

5
6
7 By: /s/ Trenton C. Packer

Dale K. Galipo

Trenton C. Packer

8 Marcel F. Sincich

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*